

## Holding the opposition: what women's studies can learn from Piontek's 'Queering of gay and lesbian studies'

Barker, Meg

Postprint / Postprint

Rezension / review

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

[www.peerproject.eu](http://www.peerproject.eu)

### Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Barker, M. (2008). Holding the opposition: what women's studies can learn from Piontek's 'Queering of gay and lesbian studies'. [Review of the book *Queering gay and lesbian studies*, by T. Piontek]. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 15(2), 129-132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506807088070>

### Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

**gesis**  
Leibniz-Institut  
für Sozialwissenschaften

### Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more Information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der  
**Leibniz**  
Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

# Book Reviews

## HOLDING THE OPPOSITION: WHAT WOMEN'S STUDIES CAN LEARN FROM PIONTEK'S QUEERING OF GAY AND LESBIAN STUDIES

Thomas Piontek

*Queering Gay and Lesbian Studies*

Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2006, 132 pp., ISBN 0-252-07280-4

In this book, Piontek provides a wonderfully clear overview of key tensions that have emerged in the last two decades as queer theory has challenged many of the underpinnings of gay and lesbian studies. Through his analysis of a range of engaging cultural and historical examples, Piontek displays the problems that have come to light in both academia and activism following queer interrogations. For this review, I briefly summarize the key ideas and examples presented in the book in order to whet the reader's appetite. Also, given the likely readership of this journal, I would like to pose the question as to what the implications of Piontek's arguments are for women's studies. Piontek himself focuses mainly on gay men's studies and activism (three out of the five chapters), with some analysis of issues that have engaged lesbian studies towards the end of the book. I feel that much of what he says can, and should, be directly applied to the theory and activism of women also.

In Chapter 1, Piontek considers the Stonewall riots, which many take as the starting point of the gay and lesbian political movement. In the summer of 1969, police raided the Stonewall Inn in New York. Instead of allowing the 'routine' raid, a crowd gathered and rioted for five days. Piontek uses a queer perspective to challenge the various histories of this event, which have been produced and have passed into popular mythology. Particularly, he points to the burgeoning political movements that preceded Stonewall (another example being the Compton's cafeteria riot in San Francisco in 1966). He questions the possibility of accessing any unified and stable narrative of the past, and he displays how Stonewall has become misrepresented as a white, gay man's rebellion despite the involvement of a diverse group of people in the event itself. This 'homonormativity' is a theme in gay and lesbian theory and activism to the present day: the argument for rights on the 'identity politics' basis that gay and lesbian people are just like heterosexuals in all respects other than their attraction for the opposite sex, and the privileging of the middle-class, white, monogamous, masculine gay male subject that goes along with this.

In Chapter 2, Piontek extends this theme of homonormativity. He explores the gay AIDS literature to display the ways in which the monogamous gay man has been held up as the ideal of gay masculinity in writing and activism. He shows

how even sex-positive writing draws on 'jeremiad' rhetorical devices (p. 45) that attribute the problems of an era to evils of the past and point the way to changes that will bring a better future (although in this case one that sees non-monogamy as radical). Piontek questions the simple binary between monogamy and promiscuity and the discourses that position either of these as better ways of being.

As well as privileging the monogamous white gay man over other queer subjects, gay rights movements have tended to deny any link between gay men and effeminacy in order to deny popular stereotypes by representing gay men as just as masculine as other men (e.g. the 'clone' image with his facial hair and jeans, and the common recent trend for gay personal ads to ask for 'straight-acting' men only). Piontek points out that this distancing from any kind of effeminacy has allowed the psychiatric *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM)* to retain the diagnosis of childhood 'Gender Identity Disorder' (GID) despite the removal of 'homosexuality' from the manual in 1973. Homonormativity has allowed the continued pathologization of children who do not fit current norms of gendered behaviour. Piontek argues that attempts to cure GID represent a continued desire to prevent adult homosexuality.

As can be seen from this brief summary of the first three chapters, homonormativity as well as heteronormativity are based on the construction of dichotomies of both sexuality and gender. People are *either* homosexual *or* heterosexual (and homonormativity aims to prove that they are similar in all respects other than their sexual attraction). People are *either* 'feminine' women *or* 'masculine' men (whether gay or straight). Anything outside these binaries is troubling and needs to be defended against with clear boundaries being drawn (Rubin, 1984). In the remainder of the book, Piontek challenges both of these dichotomies. Chapters 4 and 5 are particularly relevant to women's studies since they question the very notion of womanhood inherent in the gender dichotomy (Chapter 4) and also revisit one of the key debates of the feminist sex wars: that of sadomasochism (SM) (Chapter 5).

In Chapter 4, Piontek uses two examples of what Kate Bornstein (1995) calls 'gender defending' to support the claim that people will go to extreme lengths to maintain the illusion of the mutual exclusivity of the genders. He describes the discomfort of daytime talk show audiences when confronted with drag kings and asked to say whether they are 'really' men or women. He then discusses the rape and murder of the trans man Brandon Teena and the depiction of this in the movie *Boys Don't Cry*. Particularly, he focuses on a scene where one of his attackers shouts 'where the fuck is it?' in their pursuit, supporting Judith Butler's (2001) contention that gender is so entrenched that we have to be able to 'read someone as a gendered being to recognise his or her humanness' (p. 69). The attackers' attempt to strip Brandon displays the continued supremacy of the body as the way of determining identity (Bornstein, 1995) despite our knowledge of intersex bodies, post-op trans bodies, genderqueer identities that transcend body forms and the legal recognition (under the UK Gender Recognition Act 2004) of men with vaginas and women with penises. The discomfort of the drag king audiences in this chapter recalls the troubles experienced by some women's groups in defining who must be included and excluded and the continued distancing by many gay and feminist groups of trans and intersex issues despite their obvious relevance.

In Chapter 5, Piontek deals with non-normative sexual practices, particularly sadomasochism (SM), comparing the ways in which mainstream gay and lesbian theory and politics have often excluded 'fringe' practices (p. 6) for disturbing

homonormativity, while queer theory has embraced the possibilities of such practices in disrupting both dichotomous sexual and gender identity. A quote from Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick (1990) is worth repeating in full (although Piontek points out that even this challenge to the primacy of gender in sexual attraction continues to limit sexual activity to genital activity):

Of the very many dimensions along which the genital activity of one person can be differentiated from that of another (dimensions that include preference for certain acts, certain zones or sensations, certain physical types, a certain frequency, certain symbolic investments, certain relations of age or power, a certain species, a certain number of participants, etc. etc. etc.), precisely one, the gender of object choice, emerged from the turn of the century, and has remained as the dimension denoted by the now ubiquitous category of 'sexual orientation'. (p. 8)

Regarding gender identity, my own research (e.g. Ritchie and Barker, 2005) has explored ways in which SM play can reveal gender roles as socially constructed: by enabling SMers to take on and cast off roles, by taking the emphasis away from genital activity and by explicitly challenging taken-for-granted connections between femininity and passiveness/submissiveness (e.g. by women taking dominant roles, by being the one to penetrate, rather than be penetrated by, a man). Piontek concludes that the practices of SM communities show that it is possible to have '*bodies without orientations* and bodily pleasures that are not predicated on clear-cut sexual identities' (p. 94, emphasis in original). I would extend this to argue that they also show the possibility of bodies with differing genders, multiple genders or no genders. However, I am cautious of completely dismissing the concerns of some feminists that SM practices can reinforce problematic gender divisions and hierarchies.

Throughout the book, Piontek manages to walk the difficult tightrope between 'those who see queer theory as the *bête noire* of gay and lesbian studies and those who embrace it without reservation' (p. 1). I would argue that a similar balance needs to be struck when bringing queer theory and women's studies together: acknowledging the value in studying women's experiences and campaigning for rights on the basis of this, but also continuing to question the very dichotomies on which such studies are based. The clashes, conflicts and tensions in holding such oppositions are important for the future of gay and lesbian studies, women's studies and queer theory. I would like to end with a final quote from F. Scott Fitzgerald which Piontek uses in his conclusions and which, I think, says it all:

The test of a first-rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposed ideas in the mind at the same time, and still retain the ability to function. (p. 97)

## REFERENCES

- Bornstein, Kate (1995) *Gender Outlaw: On Men, Women, and the Rest of Us*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Butler, Judith (2001) 'Doing Justice to Someone; Sex Reassignment and Allegories of Transsexuality', *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 7(4): 621–36.

- Ritchie, Ani and Meg Barker (2005) 'Feminist SM: A Contradiction in Terms or a Way of Challenging Traditional Gendered Dynamics through Sexual Practice?', *Lesbian and Gay Psychology Review* 6(3): 227–39.
- Rubin, Gayle (1984) 'Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality', pp. 267–319 in C. Vance (ed.) *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*. London: Routledge.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky (1990) *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Meg Barker

*London South Bank University*

## RETHINKING LESBIAN MOTHERHOOD

Amy Hequembourg

*Lesbian Motherhood: Stories of Becoming*

New York and London: Harrington Park Press, 2007, 191 pp., ISBN 978-1-56023-687-0

Hequembourg proposes a refreshing new approach to the depiction of lesbian motherhood. She presents a well-informed review of relevant studies and a cogent delineation of the social and political context of lesbian motherhood. Hequembourg suggests that it is time to move beyond dichotomizing discourses that have tended to stunt thinking about the nature of lesbian motherhood by locating it within reductionist conceptualizations that portray it as a discrete state to be contrasted with 'normal' motherhood. Such discourses, which cast lesbian motherhood in terms of sameness/difference, assimilation/resistance, emerge from either/or debates that almost inevitably exude the sense of a need to defend the legitimacy of the status of lesbian motherhood. They tend also to lead researchers into rather sterile and intellectually shallow waters where the goal of the research effort becomes to prove the null hypothesis, that is, to demonstrate no differences on comparisons between children growing up in lesbian-led families and those growing up in more traditional constellations. While such studies can serve a useful function within legal contexts, Hequembourg argues that they fail to engage with the full spectrum of individual experiences of growing up in lesbian-led families and are inherently problematic on methodological and conceptual grounds.

Hequembourg has begun to develop a promising approach, based on the work of Deleuze and Guattari (1987). This represents an attempt to escape from legalistic or dichotomizing discourses, by acknowledging discourses of sameness and difference but conceptualizing them as occurring within a more dynamic system. The picture painted is of women constantly negotiating away from and towards hegemonic discourses according to varying social contexts and relationships. The most 'conforming' women (i.e. those where couples have adopted traditional 'male'/'female' gender roles) are not necessarily consciously negotiating new positions. However, Hequembourg portrays them as constantly creating social identities and statuses that evolve across differing social situations. This creates an overall impression of alternative discourses as gyrations around hegemonic discourses, with the constant